DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 707 HE 022 848

TITLE Fulfilling the Urban Mission. AASCU Studies 1985/2. September 1985.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-88044-112-7
PUB DATE Sep 85
NOTE 32p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Books (010)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Development; *Economic Development; Educational Quality; Excellence in Education; Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; Institutional Role; *Public Policy; School Policy; *State Colleges; State Universities; *Urban Areas

ABSTRACT

A collection of essays, three of which are based on speeches presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), discusses the urban mission of state colleges and universities in relation to current issues in community and economic development. The role of urban colleges and universities has become increasingly important since the 1960s, when opportunities for postsecondary education became synonymous with equal opportunity. Since the establishment of the AASCU's first office of urban affairs among higher education associations in 1968, this office has served as a central source of information on urban colleges and universities, advocating their special concerns. The essays are as follows: "Public Expectations of Higher Education Beyond 1984" (Andrew Young); "Enhancing Cooperation Between City Government and Higher Education" (Alan Beals); "Excellence in Education Through Partnerships" (W. W. Herenton); and "Can the Urban University Respond?" (Alfred B. Rollins, Jr.). (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE 022 848

aascu℠

SCUPIES

1985/2

Fulfilling the Urban Mission

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

American Association
of State Colleges and Universities

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Fulfilling the Urban Mission

AASCU Studies 1985/2

September 1985

© 1985 by American Association of State Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-1192

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Fulfilling the urban mission.

(AASCU studies; 1985/2)
1. Community and college—United States. 2. Education, Higher—United States—Aims and objectives. 3. Higher education and state—United States. 4. Municipal universities and colleges—United States. I. American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
II. Series.
KLB2329.5.A43 1985/2 378'.053 s 85-20477
[LC237] [378'.103'0973]
ISBN 0-88044-112-7

The opinions and recommendations in this book are those of the authors and are not intended to represent the official policy of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Contents

Introduction **1**

Public Expectations of Higher Education
Beyond 1984
Andrew Young **3**

Enhancing Cooperation Between City Government
and Higher Education
Alan Beals **12**

Excellence in Education Through Partnerships
W. W. Herenton **15**

Can the Urban University Respond?
Alfred B. Rollins, Jr. **18**

AASCU Committee on Urban Affairs **27**

Introduction

American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the Urban Mission

Among the 366 member institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities are more than 150 institutions located within major metropolitan areas. These public colleges and universities are important contributers to human resource development, community and business development, human services delivery, immediate and long-range planning. They also provide a focus for cultural and fine arts activities for the community as a whole.

The role of urban colleges and universities has become increasingly important since the 1960s, when opportunities for postsecondary education became synonymous with equal opportunity. Some urban institutions redirected their missions to focus more on equal educational opportunity; others were especially created to provide such opportunities. By providing accessibility to high-quality postsecondary education at a reasonable cost, urban public colleges and universities enable their students to achieve personal satisfaction as well as economic advancement.

The AASCU Committee on Urban Affairs leads the association in identifying issues of concern to urban institutions and recommending programmatic and policy initiatives to address these concerns. Over the years, the agenda of the Committee on Urban Affairs has highlighted the needs of adult, part-time, and minority students; the role of the faculty in public service and community development; the need for collaboration with elementary and secondary schools; cooperation with state and local officials and the private sector; and the need for better research on urban growth and development. The Committee on Urban Affairs was instrumental in persuading Congress to adopt the Urban Grant University Act of 1980 and is currently working to extend student financial aid to less-than-half-time students and to increase congressional support for public service programs at state colleges and universities.

Recognizing the unique aspects of the urban public college and university mission, AASCU established in 1968 the first office of urban affairs among the higher education associations. Since that time, the AASCU Office of Urban Affairs has served as a central source of information on urban colleges and universities, advocating the special concerns of urban institutions and maintaining an

active liaison with urban institutions in other sectors of higher education and with organizations representing state and local public officials. These advocacy efforts led, in 1979 to a Memorandum of Agreement with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to stimulate higher education involvement in community development and in 1985 to a Cooperative Agreement with the Economic Development Administration to highlight the role of higher education in state and local economic development. Both programs have brought the accomplishments of AASCU's urban colleges and universities to national attention and have created networks of institutions sharing programmatic interests.

In this collection of essays, three of which are based on speeches presented at AASCU's 1984 Annual Meeting, the urban mission of state colleges and universities is explored in relation to current issues in community and economic development. Two public officials and two education leaders share their thoughts on higher education's responsibilities to the public and private sectors, its relationship to elementary and secondary education, and the realities of making higher education institutions responsive to urban community needs. It is hoped that these essays will stimulate thought and discussion on an issue of ever-increasing importance, not only to colleges and universities but to the entire nation.

—Helen Roberts, Director
Office of Urban Affairs

Public Expectations of Higher Education Beyond 1984

Andrew Young
Mayor
City of Atlanta, Georgia

"Public expectations of higher education." They are enormous. I was with John Kenneth Galbraith shortly after the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert Kennedy, and I remember being overwhelmingly enthused at his prophecy that in the mid-1970s, the United States would have more people who had a college education than have not; that this country would, for the first time in any society on the planet, have a clear majority of people educated in a democratic, liberal arts, humanitarian tradition. King hoped for great things from that accumulation of learning.

Something happened, however, to public expectations for higher education. Essentially, that prophecy came up wanting. And it was realistic that it came up short. We should have known that the first generation to be educated would not be secure enough to be concerned about others. In most situations, the first generation to receive a little education, a little security, is mostly anxious about getting out of poverty and getting away from its roots. It is the second and third generations that begin to develop enough stability to be concerned about other people.

But we have seen the fruits of our efforts in education throughout the world. In my lifetime, we have lived in a period in which the United States of America totally dominated the world and the dollar reigned supreme. In this period, America could not only win the Second World War but create the United Nations. It could be the vision behind the World Bank, the World Health Organization, and the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. These organizations were totally dominated by American money and American ideas, and they took to the rest of the world the ideals and values of this country. These organizations worked so well that they made other people think for themselves.

The problems we now have in the world are not a result of our society's failures. All over the world, many of the questions challenging us are questions raised by people trained in our own institutions. What we see in the world is not a terrible threat to

American values or to American security and stability. It is, essentially, a challenge we helped create and produce. It is people beginning to think for themselves, beginning to raise ideas about how they can determine their own destiny, and beginning to challenge the authority of a single nation's right to dominate the entire planet.

The organization of the Oil Producing and Exporting Countries (OPEC), I think, indirectly reflects the success of American higher education: there could not have been an OPEC had Khomeini not gone to Harvard Business School and had there not been American and European intellectuals who were capable of moving into the oil ministries of Nigeria, Mexico, and Venezuela. We should see this not as a failure of our system but as a product of our system.

Indeed, the whole liberation movement phenomenon, including Vietnam, demonstrates our success in education. Most of us forget, or do not like to remember, that Ho Chi Minh was educated at Boston University and that much of his thinking about freedom came not from his Marxism but from his experience in this country. In the liberation movement of Zimbabwe, there were thirty American trained Ph.D.'s on the patriotic front. The leadership of that movement was essentially Bishop Abel Muzrowea of the Methodist Church; Sithole of the United Church of Christ; Joshua Nkoino, a Presbyterian lay preacher; and Robert Mugabe, a Roman Catholic school teacher who received degrees in English, political science, economics, and Latin while he was in prison. What we saw as a movement threatening American dominance was essentially a fruition of many of the values of our Judeo-Christian missionary tradition and our national system of higher education.

Now, American dominance is threatened, and we are fraught with anxiety. This anxiety makes it even more difficult for the first generation of college-educated adults to help others. But we still have the strongest economy on the face of this earth. We still have the strongest military force on the face of this earth. Yet nobody was reminded of our strength during the 444 days that Americans were held hostage by a group of students in Iran. Nobody was reminded of our strength during that period every evening at dinner when we were forced to confront America in a frustrating war in Vietnam. We could not do what we wanted to do even when we thought what we wanted to do was right. Then, to have our own values challenged from within our own society, put us in a kind of turmoil and anxiety that has left most Americans groping for a sense of certainty.

What I see in the reelection of President Reagan is America groping for a sense of certainty. I do not see that election as a victory for either left or right. Although the President had a phenomenal victory, I think that victory was not just a victory of his personality. It was a victory of a tremendous amount of organization. It was the first political campaign that really, from top to bottom, took advantage of all of the technological tools available in the election process. The Republicans had automated telephone banks. They had a direct mail appeal that brought almost every eligible voter a personal letter from the President. Republicans organized the little towns across America and involved them in national politics in ways they had not previously been involved.

And yet, even as we saw this sweeping victory by the Republican party under President Reagan's leadership, we did not see that same kind of landslide among conservative candidates. Instead, we saw that people were faced with this sense of anxiety, and they were looking for leaders who really believed in what they were doing and who were willing to live and die by their experience and beliefs. Jesse Helms won in North Carolina because he espouses a certain conservative certainty. It is an oversimplification from my point of view, but Jesse Helms believes it. He is sure of it, and he is willing to fight for it. At the same time, Tom Harkin, who is just as liberal as Jesse Helms is conservative, won Iowa, which had just recently had a very conservative Senator. But Tom Harkin is just as certain about his position on human rights, his antiwar activism, and his sense of the calling of America to a higher level of participation in education.

This was not at all a liberal-versus-conservative election. It seems to me that the American people were saying, "We don't really know which way we ought to go, and we want to give President Reagan a chance. He has had four years. It hasn't been bad. It hasn't been as bad as we thought it might be. There are no illusions, no agreement about his policies, but give him a couple of more years and see what happens." At the same time, in the Senate and congressional races and at the local level, there is what seems to be an emerging liberalism based not on guilt but on enlightened self-interest. This kind of pragmatic dealing with problems also received a mandate from the American people. But nothing changed. The illusion of strength was there. The idea of America "being back" was one that everyone wanted to believe in even when they knew better. However, the country still faces a $200-billion federal budget deficit that does not bode well for the priorities we hold dear. There is also a private-sector debt in the

banking community that is approaching $125 billion, and it seems to be rising because we are not able to keep pace with some of the competition from abroad. We are now buying more goods and services from abroad than we are selling abroad.

It really cannot be called strength when America slaps down Grenada. That situation is like the Washington Redskins beating up on a kindergarten. Bullying is not strength. But the result of that kind of maneuver is a kind of cynical dealing with foreign policy that I think we have to be honest about. Grenada happened in the wake of Americans being killed in Lebanon. Those young American men and women did not necessarily have to be in Lebanon in the first place. It was bad foreign policy, against the advice not only of the State Department, but of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was a kind of political expediency that backfired.

We are still looking for ways to make ourselves feel good. But I suspect that we are going to have to really and truly deal with problems in the next two years. They are not going away. Those in higher education, I think, will be called on to assume their rightful role and to give us the ideas and the sense of security that enable us to deal with the problems of an extremely complicated world. The treaty with the people of Panama is a good illustration of what can result from our objectives to advance democracy and a system of free enterprise. As a result of that treaty, the people of Panama recently elected a young man with a doctorate in economics from the University of Chicago as their president. In a coalition between the intellectuals and the military, they are developing a free-market approach. Panama is the only place in Central America where America's interests are secure and stable.

Panama demonstrates to me the fundamental conflict in our society that I hope we will face: Will these problems of the world be solved by military means, or will they be solved by ideas, by diplomacy, by economic development? There are very few problems that can be solved by military means. For example, the problems in Ethiopia today resulted from military efforts to solve problems of development, old problems of tribal disunity and discord, and borders divided by Europe in the 1890s between Ethiopia and Somalia. In the 1960s, the United States was supporting Ethiopia and the Russians were supporting Somalia. In the 1970s, the United States began to support Somalia and the Russians to support Ethiopia. Everybody was sending guns and tanks; nobody was educating anymore; nobody was sending tractors or growing food. The end result of some twenty-five years of cold war back and forth in an age-old tribal dispute is the famine we see now. That famine really represents the total breakdown of the

agricultural system of that area and is not just a result of drought. In contrast, Zimbabwe had a drought also, but Zimbabwe is now independent. Although we do not agree with everything that that government does, it does concern itself with seeds, fertilizer, and capital for the farming community. In spite of that famine and in spite of four years of drought in Zimbabwe, the government has managed to feed its people and export food.

We are going to have to face a military budget of some $258 billion and a federal deficit of about $210 billion. The two are just not compatible. I'm not convinced that we need five strategic systems to maintain America's security. Perhaps we could do it just as well with two or three. With the $30-50 billion we would save, we could not only balance our budget or move toward the balancing of the budget, but we could also move toward really and truly strengthening the nation.

When I think of national security, when I think of the strength of any nation, I think of Israel. Israel has been outnumbered 80 to 1. Its adversaries are richer and have had many, many more weapons. Yet Israel has survived. It survived with American aid, but it also survived because it has an educated population. The presence of an educated population has overcome the military, populational, and economic odds.

And so it concerns me that we are talking about our "national security" mainly in terms of high technology and hardware and not nearly enough in terms of the number of engineers or the amount of money that is being put into research in our colleges and universities. It is important to challenge the administration to redefine the concept of national strength according to the health, welfare, and educational and productive level of its citizens. America's colleges and universities should uphold the values of a trained American population and not let the dialogue on education disintegrate into a debate on school prayer, vouchers, and affirmative action. Those are distractions from our main task.

There can be no education, however, without some sense of value and without a sense that education derives from a purpose beyond just the need to survive. I think we are seeing this emphasis on values all over the world. It is another phenomenon we need to take more seriously. I call it the "Khomeinization" of life. You see it most clearly in Iran. There was a society that was moving rapidly from the seventeenth century into the twenty-first century under the Shah. There were many problems caused by the Shah's rule that cannot be defended, but the Shah understood the secularization of society, and the development of technology was one of his goals. This was so threatening to people that they

rebelled and adopted a kind of throwback to religious fanaticism. We see the same phenomenon happening all over North Africa, but we also see it to some extent in this country. In Poland, the total secularization by the state of the process of human development has spawned a massive rebellion in the Roman Catholic Church and among the workers and the students.

Man cannot live by bread alone. There has got to be some sense of purpose for which we are called beyond ourselves and beyond our own self-interest and survival. This fundamental debate about the values of our society really needs to go on in higher education. We need to define the religious commitments of our society to those things beyond ourselves that promote and extend the values that, by our experiences, we have found to be relevant and meaningful.

At the same time, at the local level, there's a crying out in urban America for people to do for urban America what state universities did in the last century for rural America. We have the most productive agricultural system in the history of the world. It did not come about by accident. It came about through land-grant colleges. It came about through state farm programs. It came about as a result of the integration of the university system with the agricultural community. The benefits that accrued from that relationship feed not only America but the entire world.

A similar kind of relationship between universities and cities is necessary. I think the universities can learn from the cities as much as the cities can learn from the universities. There are some things we have done in Atlanta that work well. The organization of poor people in the city under the poverty program, our neighborhood block organization, made Atlanta the kind of city in which the rich and the poor could communicate. Because of that block-by-block organization, and because of the involvement of the poor, black and white, in decision making in the city, we have been able to do things in Atlanta that cities not similarly organized could not do: develop a mass transit system, tax ourselves for purposes of education that we hold dear. Everybody participates in these decisions and understands how to make this huge metropolitan area function and how to get democracy functioning at the local level without distracting from the regional and national needs of the cities.

This is one of the challenges in which I long for our state universities and city colleges particularly to get involved. There needs to be a relationship between education and productivity. A person should not be able to get a degree in political science without organizing a block and without knowing how the politics of

society work. One should not get a degree in economics and still be broke all one's life. Somehow there has to be a relationship between what we are teaching and the ability to produce some meaningful goods or services for the community as a whole. I am haunted by the fact that India, several decades ago, had 50,000 college graduates who were unemployed. Here was a nation that needed trained people, but the people it trained did not know how to do anything. If a person gets a college education, he or she ought to be able to get a job if society has not provided one.

I hope we will see emerging ways to relate our universities to our economic development needs. We have seen an experiment in affirmative action at the economic level in Atlanta work in a very meaningful way. Maynard Jackson, my predecessor, decided to help black entrepreneurs share in the building of an airport. A $600-million project was built with minority and female entrepreneurs accounting for 25 percent of the contracts. The recent runway we just completed, the fourth runway, now gives us the capacity to handle more than 2,000 flights a day. Forty-three percent of this $130-million project was completed by minority and female entrepreneurs. What this means is that we not only share the wealth of an existing pie but have made the environment so attractive that new wealth keeps coming in. The pie is getting bigger, and everybody is able to work together in sharing it. We have, consequently, one of the lowest unemployment rates of any city in America, including unemployment of blacks. The contracts given to black entrepreneurs allowed them to train young black men and women who might not otherwise be trained and employed. Making the system work means seeing to it that economic development occurs not only at the top but at the bottom. People need access to venture capital, and people at the bottom need to have opportunities to be entrepreneurs and to be a part of the total capital formation that enables a community to grow. One of the mandates for our university system is to work out those models and to research and develop the patterns that have succeeded in one city and report these to other cities.

Finally, American colleges and universities have an international role to play. I saw how important this role could be when I was involved in negotiations over a project for a $400-million fertilizer plant in Nigeria at a time when the United States was running a $20-billion trade deficit with Nigeria alone. A Japanese and Italian consortium had come in $60 million below the American company's bid. But I reminded the American company, which is based in Houston, and the Nigerian government that the American company could transfer the technology. I said, almost

as a last-ditch effort to save the project, "Well, if this American company gets the bid, there are already Nigerian students in Houston who could be trained by the time the project is completed in four years. So you're not just buying technology, you're getting a genuine *transfer* of technology when you do business with an American firm." Making that link between the American educational system and the business community made it possible for the company to get that contract.

When we have a $125-billion trade deficit, we are going to have to export more to keep our economy solvent. One of the secrets of the success of export trade in the world is our universities. It is in the foreign students who are here—an educational and economic elite among their own countrymen. These students, as they relate to the American business, political, and academic environment, become part of a potential network that can help America trade abroad and thereby generate jobs at home.

There are many public expectations for higher education for 1984 and beyond, and I approach these expectations with a certain degree of optimism. I'm convinced that if we can do what we have done already with such limited resources, we can do much more with the high technology that now spans the globe. The resources at our command are so enormous that there is not a single problem we cannot define or solve. We need only the political will, the rationale, and consensus.

Consensus, in a democratic society, has to be molded through education. I challenge the systems of higher education in our American society: help us to be comfortable in our world; help us to understand the social forces that are shaping our cities; help us to define and live with the tensions that can either make us a creative society or destroy us. From our common educational heritage, we can derive ideas that can lead us toward peace and prosperity not only for ourselves but for all humankind. I do not think these goals are too lofty. I think they are well within our reach. In fact, unless we find ways to reach these goals, it is questionable whether we can survive at all.

All our expectations in higher education, politics, and religion are coming together. Although we are not willing or able to attempt to dominate the world militarily, I do not think that any of us has ever given up on the great American belief that we have created something in this society that everybody in the world wants to share. I do not think we have any trouble exporting American values and American ideals. They have proved their worth because they work. We have pulled together people from all over the world of every different background and culture. In

America, we have molded from the entire planet a world in miniature, a world that works. A world that succeeds. A world that generates wealth and redistributes it somewhat fairly. A world that creates opportunity and allows people to advance on the basis of their abilities. A world of justice. A world of peace. A world that still exists with a certain level of freedom. Along with that freedom goes the responsibility to share and the responsibility to continue to grow. If we are able to do these things, I think we will more than fulfill the public expectations of higher education in 1984 and beyond.

Enhancing Cooperation Between City Government and Higher Education

Alan Beals
Executive Director
National League of Cities

State colleges and universities can provide valuable research and expertise to cities to foster understanding and improvement of federal-urban government relationships. These relationships have changed dramatically, and negatively, in the last few years.

In the national approach to the problems of cities, there have been major shifts in emphasis, commitment, and roles and responsibilities. There have been deep cuts in federal assistance to cities over the past four or five years. Debates have arisen over the proposed new federalism program of 1981-82 that would shift major program responsibilities back to state and local government.

Indeed, the 1984 presidential election demonstrated that there has been little interest in cities among either of the major parties. Unlike other presidential elections, the 1984 election yielded little opportunity for involvement in helping to shape an urban plank, from either of the party platforms. One party did not hold hearings at all. The other held some perfunctory hearings, and their effect was minimal.

Cities have been ignored despite the fact that, between 1981 and 1984, they experienced their worst recession in forty years. Many cities have not and are not prospering while the national economy has improved in the last year or so. Many cities still have double-digit inflation. Cities are the places where the unemployed tend to be concentrated.

Cities have been coping with fewer financial resources. They have been shifting taxes to special fees, or service charges, in an attempt to cost out the services of government and assign some special fee bases. They have made direct cuts. Almost a quarter of a million fewer people have been employed in cities since 1979. Current levels of city employment are at the same level as they were in 1974.

Cities have also been deferring maintenance to survive. The results of deferred maintenance are evident in cities around the country. Because the effects of deferred maintenance do not show up right away, it is easier to cope by deferring than by cutting back even more on services.

All these conditions in cities add up to a new agenda for cities at a time of national economic pressure. The tremendous national deficit is going to require sacrifices for the foreseeable future, and one of the sacrifices frequently discussed at the national level is the cities. Reductions in federal programs that affect local government have already caused sacrifices in the cities, and this will continue.

Tax policy is also an area in which the state colleges and universities could provide assistance and research to the cities. These institutions would look at the effects of proposed tax policy schemes on cities. Most of the so-called benefits that affect cities on the tax-expenditure side of the budget are under attack at the national level. They include the deductibility of state and local income taxes and cities' authority to issue bonds to finance public improvements, including bonds to finance student education loans. Tax policy is an area about which there is poor information available on the impact of alternative policies. Much work needs to be done.

A good example of how tax policy affects cities occurred with the Tax Reform Act of 1981. Under this Act, Congress authorized the sale and lease back of public facilities. Cities did not support this legislation; it was advocated by the private sector. In 1984, the federal government reversed itself because of perceived abuses on the sale/lease-back provisions. The biggest abuse was one initiated by the U.S. Navy. That, and a couple of other perceived abuses, led to a major shift in policy. In the typical federal fashion of overreacting, that policy is going to cost billions of dollars at the local level. The things society has traditionally purchased or leased from the private sector—police cars, computer systems, typewriters—are now all going to cost a lot more money because the federal government overreacted. Probably, that cost will be several billion dollars. The Treasury Department's position is that the cost will be neglible. Somewhere in between these two positions there has to be the right number, but there has been little research on the problem.

We also continue to see the growth of federal mandates requiring state and local governments to provide services. Most federal mandates require financial implementation. Yet federal funds have been cut back. What should cities be doing about this paradox? What can state colleges and universities do about some of these issues?

I think there is a need for more urban research. Cities have to look to the universities and colleges for help in this area. There is a good bit of research going on, but we need to have a more fo-

cused research agenda. We need to decide in some fashion what constitutes a national urban research agenda, and then find ways of assigning tasks and working out specific solutions.

We also need some major work done in the field of program evaluation as we go though the difficult task of determining which national programs are most important to cities. We need to know those that are effective, those that are not effective, and the gradations in between. The federal government does not set priorities. Consequently, there is no coherent national urban agenda among the federal agencies. Generally, each agency simply runs its own programs. In addition, there is little or no consultation with the major players in state and local government to set an urban agenda. Finally, the research on the cost of programs is driven by predetermined policy conclusions, often poorly designed and, not uncommonly, a waste of public money.

With this set of problems, there is a great need for the intellectual and analytical capabilities that state colleges and universities can provide. The major issues before us over the next several years can be a fruitful area for collaboration between higher education and cities.

Excellence in Education Through Partnerships

W. W. Herenton
Superintendent
Memphis City Schools, Tennessee

One consequence of the current excellence in education movement has been the higher education community's revived interest in its role and responsibilities in improving the quality of public education, especially in the high schools. The challenge for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, school superintendents, school board members, and state board members is to transform the rhetoric about excellence into meaningful plans for action, such as the proposals AASCU members are seriously considering to form partnerships with urban local school districts.

In striving for excellence, some key factors are the profile, purposes, and mission of the AASCU membership, and the importance of providing equality of educational opportunity. I want to affirm that when I speak about excellence, I am also talking about *equity*.

Excellence in education can come about only through meaningful partnerships and actions by school and college people working in close cooperation with students, parents, taxpayers, government officials, and the private sector.

These is an urgent need for such cooperation. I believe that we are sitting on a social time bomb. Many of our cities—Detroit, Chicago, New York—have high school drop-out rates of about 35 to 45 percent. Many of these cities are also plagued by a high unemployment rate. Their school districts are producing functional illiterates, youngsters who are ill-prepared for successful study in state colleges and universities. We can ill afford to allow a large segment of our population to be undereducated or not appropriately educated at all.

I am pleased to report, however, that in a few selected school districts across this nation there are improvement efforts that should ensure that future high school graduates will be better prepared to enter higher education. There are now intensive partnership programs between institutions of higher education and high schools. I have been greatly impressed with the Boston Compact. In that partnership, institutions of higher education have joined with the Boston Public School System to improve

student learning and to provide opportunities for university personnel to use the public school system as a laboratory. In Memphis, we give several college professors from the Department of Education administration internships in some of our inner-city high schools. Many of these faculty members are prospective administrators but have really lost the sensitivity they need about what actually takes place in the management of public school systems. More such arrangements are emerging in which college teachers intern in public school settings and, conversely, some public school teachers serve as young professors in higher education.

Concerning staff renewal, there is a great opportunity for AASCU institutions to work with public school systems to improve teacher preparation. In the Memphis City School System, for example, we are working diligently with the Department of English Literature at Memphis State University to teach our high school students to write. Approximately eighty-five of our teachers and administrators have worked with college faculty members to develop a writing curriculum and to set up an effective training program for teachers to improve the writing skills of students.

Another initiative occurring in many parts of the country is the improvement of science education. In Memphis, we have formed a partnership between the schools of engineering in several universities and our chemistry and physics departments to help revamp the curriculum and to help gauge what will be required of our students as they enter the scientific fields.

Collaboration between schools and colleges is also important for research. Often, the research on education conducted by colleges and universities is not shared with the faculties of elementary and secondary schools. We frequently supply the universities with the laboratories for research, but seldom do we sit down with them to discuss the particular applications of research and how to utilize that research to improve teaching in the public schools.

Unfortunately, partnerships rarely concentrate on an area of need in American society: urban communities. The traditional "have nots" in American society, the minorities and the poor, have not fared well educationally. Unless corrective steps are taken immediately, minority and poor students will continue to be at a severe disadvantage in trying to compete in American society. We must make all of our schools effective institutions for all of our children.

Many of our districts are participating in the effective schools movement. We in Memphis firmly believe that all students

should be expected to learn. In the Memphis City School System, we have been involved in an effective schools program for three years. In our district, the effective schools movement involves twenty-one all-black schools, with many students who come from families with an income of $5,000 or less, headed by a single woman. In many of those schools, we have been able to realize achievement test score results at the national norm or above. Yet many educators would contend that such achievement is not possible by the population I have described. We believe that if we can sustain the rising academic achievement rates in our junior high schools through our secondary schools, better students will come into your colleges and universities.

Reform initiatives that have been launched by state legislatures and governors will also improve education. There is a great need to improve teacher accountability and to reward teachers who exemplify a high degree of competence. The career ladder program in Tennessee is one that I think will produce a large cadre of well-qualified and well-paid teachers. Many states also require a type of competency-based teacher certification. We are exploring this possibility in Tennessee to ensure that when teachers leave college, we will have another opportunity to look at them before they are certified.

Public schools have also made an effort to address another important concern: critical reasoning skills. There are five urban districts working with the College Board in an experimental project designed to improve the reasoning and critical thinking skills of urban public school students. This program is likely to have very good results, and we hope that other school districts will become involved in teaching reasoning and critical thinking skills.

We in public school education want to send well-prepared high school graduates on to college. We are working very hard to achieve that goal.

Can The Urban University Respond?

Alfred B. Rollins, Jr.
Former President
Old Dominion University

Few educational ideas have been debated more vigorously or at greater length in recent years than the concept of the "urban university." It is now well established that the term refers not to the university that happens to be in a city but rather to the university that makes a primary business of serving the needs of the city and its people.

The Challenge to the Urban University

As Andrew Young has indicated, there is a great "crying out in urban America for people to do for urban America what essentially state universities did in the last century for rural America." Not every downtown university proposes to do that.

The concept is difficult because metropolitan areas differ enormously in population and structure. One institution—City College of New York, for example—may concentrate heavily on service to new Americans. Another, equally urban, may heavily invest in educating middle-class suburban and commuter populations. A third may be both minority-oriented and yet involved in the economic and industrial development of its metropolitan region. Some institutions may show their urban mission most clearly in their teaching, others in their service programs, still others in their research.

And yet we know that cities need the attention, support, and leadership of their own local universities, and that large numbers of universities have a distinctly urban cast to both their mission statements and their functions. In the last analysis, it is the functions, not the labels, that count. Cities need educational systems and approaches that reach out to the city people—of all races and classes. Cities need to have the brains of their universities directed to resolving urban problems in both research and service programs. We should take care not to be confused by organization, name, or financial support system. Boston has, for example, four great urban universities, one public and three private, addressing somewhat different mixes of students and programs but all oriented to the needs and aspirations of the Boston metropolitan area.

Political leaders of the cities have defined these needs and aspirations clearly. In this report, Mayors Marion Barry and Andrew Young, Dr. Herenton and Dr. Beals outline some of the demands that must properly be made on the urban universities by the societies that support them. Herenton and Young concentrate on the need of the whole society to education the children who will be tomorrow's citizen workers and leaders. Young points out that we must invest in the people as well as the machines of the future; it is a matter of capital investment of the most essential kind. Herenton warns against the phony dichotomy by which we are being asked to choose quality *or* access. He insists, quite correctly, that we must have both. But, he notes, we need quality in the education of *all* young people: there has been no real commitment to excellence in the education of the disadvantaged minority.

The undereducation of minorities is the nation's major time bomb. If the workers and leaders of tomorrow are not both educated and trained, the whole society will be impoverished. And its stability will be threatened by the anger of its unproductive masses. There is certainly a special role for the urban universities in working with the school systems to defuse that bomb. Universities provide role models, opportunity, and challenge for the people who are actually going to be here and who will make or break the next generations.

Beals looks more toughly at the need for research in urban problems. Urban universities must investigate the intricate issues of tax policy and program evaluation, the needs and possibilities inherent in both the physical and human areas of urban life.

But, good as they are, these commentaries identify only half the promise, half the opportunity. Although urban universities must certainly perform even more effectively in providing educational opportunity for people and applied research for government, they must also address themselves vigorously to two other matters: (1) they must engage in the fundamental scientific, technical and economic research essential to the economic rebirth of the cities; (2) they must provide, at a high and sensitive level, the continuing educational opportunities demanded by modern industry. The economic imperative is clear. Urban universities must be everyone's universities. It will no longer be sufficient for their leaders and faculties to think of themselves as serving the workers, the minorities, the new Americans of the urban centers. They must also serve the industries that provide the jobs, the managers and scientists who provide the intellectual capital of those industries; they must indeed serve middle class as well as lower class, whites as well as blacks, Latinos, and Asians. And they must be real uni-

versities—exploring the world at its very edges, reaching out in the tradition of the land-grant institutions, and providing opportunity to all.

The Need for Public Support

Ironically, the need becomes more compelling at the very moment when government is retreating from concern for the cities and the national parties have all but abandoned both the urban cause and higher education. The new rhetoric attempts to persuade people to view education as yet another welfare or income-transfer program to be balanced against food stamps and Medicaid. And while political leaders assert that private enterprise should undertake the solution of urban and educational problems, tax "reforms" are proposed to discourage and destroy such initiatives.

Building for the urban future still requires significant public-sector investment. To leave policy at the mercy of the land developer, the construction speculator, and the city hall bureaucrat promises only a return to planless anarchy, which decentralizes construction and centralizes social problems, and to the mindless priorities of profit, which leave the human costs for other generations to pay.

We still need substantial and reliable public investment to pay for mature and thorough research on urban problems, to initiate adequate training and retraining programs for a modern and flexible work force, to address the problems of urban and bilingual education, to make it possible for our urban regions to become attractive environments for modern economic development.

Faculty Development A Key

But not all the difficulties are external. University faculties have been one of the major problems. The question is "How do we develop education and applied research sensitive to the needs of cities and their people and flexible to changing environments? The answer: "With great difficulty!" Most faculty members in this generation have been educated in traditional universities with grant commitments to "basic" research and to the independence of the researcher. Accountability for social relevance or significance has been left to the funding agencies: foundations, government, and corporations. Strangely, the very professors who bow to priorities set by the Department of Defense, National Science Foundation, the Ford Foundation, or the great national corporations react with rage when their own universities suggest that some research effort be addressed to applied problems of the cit-

ies that nurture these universities. And similar resistance arises to addressing the needs and problems of urban students. Standards of quality become confused with tradition or convenience until it becomes a major problem to offer courses at night or on weekends or in time-packages addressed to the needs of workers or their employers. And it becomes almost impossible to develop curricula adjusted to special needs. Innovative institutions, which urban conditions demand, present challenges to traditional views of faculty competence, faculty philosophy, and faculty governance. As long as the program remains dictated by only the faculty, without external stimulus or leadership, the concept of a "modern university" or an "urban university" may be merely an oxymoron.

Faculty attitudes have had a great deal to do with the widespread notion that the word *urban* suggests a second- or third-rate institution. Quality, many faculty members feel, is closely related to basic research and traditional curricula. The existence of a doctoral program is the measure of significance, rather than commitment to significant missions. And societal attitudes follow the faculty's lead.

Interdependence with the Urban Environment

It would be easy to be discouraged in 1985 about the future of the urban university. Faculty resistance, federal abandonment, and popular reaction against special programs for the disadvantaged and minorities present a powerful force. But the fact is, the problems are still with us and the political potential of the urban university's constituency is still enormous. Unfortunately, our own supporters sometimes do not understand what is happening to them and to their interests, and it may well be that the lethal damage to the urban regions of the country may not be well understood until too late.

We must meet these challenges, and we can. What will it take?

First, we had better try to understand the substance of our problems. Urban areas are changing—rapidly. Population movements and economic patterns are becoming more complex, but the dominating fact is interdependence. It is no longer possible to think of the problems of Manhattan and of Long Island, of North Philadelphia and of Chester County, of Norfolk and of Virginia Beach as if they were separate. The fates of universities in D.C. and those in nearby Maryland and Virginia are inextricable. The work of Washington and of Arlington and Montgomery County is all of one fabric.

And *purpose* has become more clear. It is now impossible to think of the education of young blacks as if that were an act of

charity: their education has become so clearly central to the security of the republic and the success of its economy. It is literally everybody's business, and everyone's fate is tied to the growing proportion of our economy that is unproductive, the expanding areas of vacant land and abandoned factories in our high-tax cities.

As we begin to understand our problems, we must work vigorously to help our constituents understand them. A good start might involve making certain that people comprehend what is already being done. Many of our problems stem from the failure of the general public to understand that universities are not merely *teaching* institutions, that indeed much of our national *research* and intellectual *service* comes from our universities.

A second imperative is the need to be clear and functional about our objectives. If we are to maintain our much-valued identification with the moral expectations of the nation, we must translate them into specific purposes and anticipated results. Our campaign for the funding of urban research has made clear that general promises of great results have lost their glitter. We must now address ourselves to difficult expectations of hard results. Are we, in fact, going to teach people to think analytically and critically, to be self-starting, lifelong learners, to become the kind of intellectuals capable of inventing and maintaining a world their teachers could not imagine? Are we indeed going to help our cities understand how to fund themselves, how to save themselves, and how to behave themselves productively? And how are we going to do those things?

Organizational Issues

But if we are ever to address the budget gap between urban needs and university capabilities, we shall also need to organize our efforts in new kinds of ways. Present traditional structures make life difficult, if not impossible, for institutions with an urban mission. Department structures enhance the rigidity of discipline and basic research. Collegiate and university structures encourage competition rather than cooperation to address urban problems. For many institutions, the real facts of life seem related to private/public rivalries within the city, to fights between old and new institutions. Statewide organization of public higher education often swamps the urban interest beneath the weight of traditional institutions in the rural areas. And at the national level, the need to arrive at a consensus among the great educational organizations has often resulted in the belief that stressing urban interests is divisive and fragmenting.

It is instructive that the much-vaunted land-grant model was successful precisely because it approached the problem organizationally. Faculty expectations were changed, research objectives focused, and specialized personnel developed when colleges were specifically organized to address the agricultural problems and serve the rural interests. It was clearly recognized that traditional colleges of arts and sciences would not address the needs, so schools of agriculture and home economics were created with broad educational, research, and service missions. It was also recognized that single colleges standing alone might soon be cut down, so one of the most successful national educational research and political networks ever developed was constructed in support of the rural mission.

It is encouraging that three organizations devoted to the welfare of urban universities have recently been developed: the Urban Affairs Office of AASCU, the Urban Division of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and the Association of Urban Universities. But this can only be a beginning. Although the separate organizations are needed to tap the resources and support of our existing structure, they must work more and more dynamically together to present a national program and a national image. And it is also time for us to address nationally the central question: How should we organize to implement the urban mission?

As important as is organization, the more significant challenge is dynamic and political. Successful activity as an urban university required the university to abandon neutrality and live dangerously in the world of controversial issues. An urban university must lead the way, as did the land-grant universities of 100 years ago. We have certainly learned that being merely a response system without value or commitment is a dead end. It is no longer safe for universities merel to mirror the status quo. The old regime itself adjusts or atrophies. And society often forgets to provide the stimulus that makes it possible for us to respond. Our friends will go elsewhere if they cannot turn to us for research and advice related to real problems and to the values and purpose of life.

The President's Role

Leadership may not turn out to be as difficult a matter for universities as it may seem at first. We have certainly learned how to lead in both production and consumption in agriculture, in many aspects of national affairs, in scientific and technical matters of great import. It may be that, given the will, those same universities that have developed the weapons and the technical magic of society, which furnish Washington with an unending supply of political, diplomatic, and economic policy makers, can also learn to lead rather than follow in the solution of urban problems. The successful urban universities already have. We cannot sit by and say merely that if someone will pay, we can perhaps think about the problem. We must begin to be willing to say, "Here is how the problem appears. Here is what should be done. And here is what *we* propose to do about it."

But if universities are to lead, their leaders must in turn lead. And here is the hub of the problem. With a few notable exceptions, American university leaders have not invested themselves in a public, substantial, and continuing commitment to the service of cities. We know from experience that universtiy presidents, deans and board members have enormous power to wield, if they will. It is power to persuade, to put the law and the money on the right side, to use their public platform to establish purpose and to enlist support. The urban mission has suffered from lack of commitment at the top. And something *can* be done about that. University presidents who are committed to the urban mission can provide the vision and evoke the spirit of a university; they can provide leadership for a faculty interested in results; they can inspire public excitement and, with it, public funds.

Commitment is the issue. If we mean business in the urban universities, we need to stop arguing about the titles and definitions and start talking about the needs of our society and the functions of our institutions. And we should push aside the phony issues pushed on us. Urban institutions are not second rate. Institutions that are underfunded and badly led may be second rate. Indeed, the only institution that deserves to serve an important urban region is one with the quality of a great national institution and a commitment to the dignity of its urban mission. We are getting there: there are models in every major region of the nation. Consider, for example, Northeastern, City University of New York, Temple, The University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Missouri-St. Louis, UCLA.

The whole society needs us. It will stand or fall with its cities. And cities can stand to their challenge only if they are served and led by centers of learning that combine world-class quality with home-town commitment.

Committee on Urban Affairs
1984-85

Helen Roberts (*Staff Liaison*)
Director, Office of Urban Affairs
American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Alexander F. Schilt (*Chair*)
Chancellor
University of Houston, Downtown

James M. Rosser (*Vice Chair*)
President
California State University, Los Angeles

George E. Ayers
President
Chicago State University (IL)

Richard Butwell
President
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Richard J. Combs
Chancellor
Purdue University, Calumet (IN)

George Frederickson
President
Eastern Washington University

Arnold B. Grobman
Chancellor
University of Missouri at St. Louis

James A. Hefner
President
Jackson State University (MI)

Neil Humphrey
President
Youngstown State University (OH)

Noah N. Langdale, Jr.
President
Georgia State University

Leonard Lief
President
City University of New York Herbert H. Lehman College

Robert C. Maxson
President
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

William J. Maxwell
President
Jersey City State College (NJ)

William V. Muse
President
University of Akron (OH)

George A. Pruitt
President
Thomas A. Edison State College (NJ)

Walter B. Waetjen
President
Cleveland State University (OH)

Harrison B. Wilson, Jr.
President
Norfolk State University (VA)

American Association
of State Colleges and Universities

One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/293-7070

Allan W. Ostar
President